

**FSM LEA Part B Local Performance Plan (LPP) for 2014-2018**

\*\*\*\*\*

**INTRODUCTION:**

The Special Education Program, Department of Education Kosrae State serves as the Local Education Agency (LEA) responsible for general supervision of special education and related services delivered in the state of Kosrae through its Department of Education, known as the Local Education Agency (LEA). As a LEA, Kosrae facilitated a process for ensuring broad stakeholder input in the development of the Local Performance Plan based on the SEA (FSM) Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA) Part B State Performance Plan (SPP). As required by FSM-Department of Education, that compliances and monitoring activities are carried out in each LEA, the LEA must submit an Annual Local Performance Plan and a quarterly progress updates within that year.

*Initial and ongoing professional development is provided by Western Regional Resource Center (WRRC) to support the reading program.*

*National Teacher Certification Standard and the Strategic Development Plan will underpin the Kosrae State professional development activities for teachers, school principals, teacher's trainers, curriculum specialists and other support system within the Department of Education. Professional Development System: The professional development of teachers and support services providers will be practice-based, with the emphasis on improvement of teaching and learning outcomes in the classroom and its support system through training and staff development program.*

The plan will be develop by the Special Education key staff, NDOE Bridging the Cap Representative, Chief of Curriculum and Instruction, Interagency council members, parents, Principal, coaches of the Pilot school on RTI and State RTI Team. Upon receiving the review draft from NDOE of the LPP, the program will present the LPP to the Director of Education and the Interagency Council Members.

Upon receipt of written approval of Kosrae State LPP from FSM- DOE Special Education Office, Kosrae State DOE will disseminate the LPP utilizing the following process.

- Upon receiving the approved Kosrae Special Education Local Performance Plan, the Kosrae State Special Education Coordinator will share the plan with the State Director of Education, Governor's Office and the Kosrae State Legislature and schedule a program staff meeting to share all activities that are approved.
- A letter of notification will be disseminated to each Municipal Office notifying the public about the approved plan and where to get the plan for their information about the program activities.
- Following the staff meeting, the coordinator with the case managers will meet with the Kosrae Parental Network and Interagency Council to go over the approved plan.
- Special Education staff will visit each of the community schools once a year to explain to parents and public about the LPP content.
- During the annual Disability Day, the LPP will be disseminated to all participants.
- Copy of the plan will also be posted on the FSM Sped website and Project Lift Weekly website.
- At the end of each quarter during Fiscal Year 2015, beginning on December 2014, updates on the progress of each indicator measurement and improvement activities will be reported to the FSM-DOE and provided to the Interagency Council members during its quarterly meetings.

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**IDEA Indicator 1: Percent of youth with IEPs graduating from high school with a regular diploma.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**IDEA Measurement:** States must report using the adjusted cohort graduation rate required under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). NOTE: ESEA does not apply to FSM. FSM shall report using an event calculation.

**IDEA Data Source:** Same data as used for reporting to the Department under Title I of ESEA. NOTE: ESEA does not apply to FSM. FSM utilizes the following data sources:

- # of youth with IEPs graduating with a high school diploma, consistent with FSM's IDEA exit data.
- # of youth with an IEP who started the school year with the required number of credits to be assigned as a senior/12<sup>th</sup> grader for the school year.

**IDEA Performance Data & Discussion for FFY 2016 (2016-2017):**

State-LEA	# & % Graduates (Grad) with a Diploma		
	2016-2017		
	(a)	(b)	(c)
	# Seniors	# Grad	% Grad (b)/(a) x 100
Seniors <b>without</b> IEPs	142	130	91%
Seniors <b>with</b> IEPs	8	8	100%

The total enrollment at the Kosrae High School for the school year 2016-2017 was 642 including students with disabilities. The number of seniors at the beginning of that school year was at 142, 134 of this are students without IEPs and 8 of them are students with IEPs. By the end of that same school year there were 130 students who were able to graduate with a regular high school diploma. Eight (8) of the graduates are students with IEP. The program was able to meet its target (77%) for the SY 2016-2017 with all the 8 students with IEPs graduated with a regular high diploma including that two (2) of these students were able to pass the COMET for the Degree Program.

School enrollment are collected and reported to the Kosrae Department of Education at the beginning and ending of each school year as required by the department including Kosrae High School for reporting and monitoring purposes.

Existing policy requires that a high school student must complete a minimum of 28 credit hours with a 2.0 grade point average in order to graduate from high school. However, proposed changes require that a minimum of 22 credit hours can qualify a senior to graduate with a regular diploma.

**IDEA FSM SPP AND LEA Targets for FFY 2014-2018:**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets	
	FSM SPP	State-LEA
<b>2014</b> (2014-2015)	<b>62%</b>	<b>67%</b>
<b>2015</b> (2015-2016)	<b>67%</b>	<b>72%</b>

**FSM STATE: Kosrae**

---

<b>2016</b> (2016-2017)	<b>72%</b>	<b>77%</b>
<b>2017</b> (2017-2018)	<b>77%</b>	<b>82%</b>
<b>2018</b> (2018-2019)	<b>82%</b>	<b>87%</b>

**FSM-SPECIFIC Indicator 1: Percent of 8<sup>th</sup> grade completers with an IEP who enter high school the following school year.**

**FSM-SPECIFIC Measurement:** States must report the percentage of 8<sup>th</sup> grade completers with an IEP who enroll as 9<sup>th</sup> graders with an IEP the following school year.

**FSM-SPECIFIC Data Source:** FSM utilizes the following data sources:

- # of students with an IEP who completes 8<sup>th</sup> grade.
- Of the 8<sup>th</sup> grade completers with an IEP, the # who enrolls as a 9<sup>th</sup> grader with an IEP the following school year.

**FSM-SPECIFIC Performance Data & Discussion for FFY 2016 (2016-2017):**

State-LEA	# & % 8 <sup>th</sup> Graders Entering to High School		
	2016-2017		
	(a)	(b)	(c)
	# 8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Completers for SY 2016-2017	# in (a) enrolled as 9 <sup>th</sup> Graders in SY 2016-2017	% Continue to High School (b)/(a) x 100
8 <sup>th</sup> Graders <b>without</b> IEPs	96		%
8 <sup>th</sup> Graders <b>with</b> IEPs	11		%

In the school year 2016-2017 there were 107 students at the 8<sup>th</sup> grade level in Kosrae. Out of this there were 11 students with IEP. All of the eleven (11) or 100% of students with IEP who graduated from elementary were able to enroll at the 9<sup>th</sup> grade level or at KHS.

Number of students graduated from Elementary level is collected and stored in the Department of Education data system and verified through the reporting collected from each of the six elementary schools at the end of each school year.

**Note: Break down by school/school enrollment data/ state that KHS entrance test is no longer administered.**

	8 <sup>th</sup> grade IEP/GEN.ED.	9 <sup>th</sup> grade
Sansrik Elementary School	0/21	0/21
Tafunsak Elementary School	4/54	4/54
Walung Elementary School	1/6	1/6
Malem Elementary School	2/26	2/26
Lelu Elementary School	2/30	2/30
Utwe Elementary School	2/20	2/20

**FSM-SPECIFIC LEA Targets for FFY 2014-2018:**

FFY (WOIEP)	Measurable and Rigorous Target
	State-LEA
<b>2014</b> (2014-2015)	<b>65%</b>
<b>2015</b> (2015-2016)	<b>65%</b>
<b>2016</b> (2016-2017)	<b>67%</b>
<b>2017</b> (2017-2018)	<b>70%</b>
<b>2018</b> (2018-2019)	<b>72%</b>

FFY (IEP)	Measurable and Rigorous Target
	State-LEA
2014 (2014-2015)	90%
2015 (2015-2016)	90%
2016 (2016-2017)	92%
2017 (2017-2018)	95%
2018 (2018-2019)	97%

**INDICATOR 1: Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2016 (2016-2017):**

Activities	Timeline	Resources
1. <b>Improve Data Collection and Reporting:</b> Develop data collecting mechanism for general education.		RR Supervisors Principals Data Managers
2. <b>Build Systems and Infrastructures:</b> Community Based Education “ Job Shadowing”		Secondary Transition Teachers Secondary Counselor High School Principal

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**IDEA Indicator 2: Percent of youth with IEP’s dropping out of high school.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**IDEA Measurement:** Use same data source and measurement that the State used to report in its FFY 2013 LPP.

**IDEA Data Source:** Same exit data as used for reporting to the Department under IDEA section 618 for high school drop-outs. FSM utilizes the following data sources:

- # of youth with IEPs dropping out of high school, consistent with FSM’s IDEA exit data.
- # of youth with IEPs attending public high school in grades 9<sup>th</sup>-12<sup>th</sup> at the beginning of the school year.

**IDEA Performance Data for FFY 2016 (2016-2017):**

State LEA	# & % Drop-Outs		
	2016-2017		
	(a)	(b)	(c)
	#9-12th Graders	#9-12th Drop-Outs	% Drop-Outs (b)/(a) x 100
Youths <b>without</b> IEPs	597	36	%
Youths <b>with</b> IEPs	45	4	8%

Total enrollment at the Kosrae High School in school year 2016-2017 was 642, including student with disability. The number of drop-outs for students without IEP was 45 or % while number of students with IEPs was 4 or 8% .

Students at KHS are dropping out of school for the following reasons; excessive absents, fighting on campus, did not meet the GPA requirements, or self-withdrawal. As required under the IDEA regulation on students with IEPs dropping out more than 10 days, the program must as possible bring backs these students and provides services to them whether there at home or at school. For those IEP student who decided not to return back to high school within ten days the program services will not be provided to them.

**IDEA FSM SPP AND LEA Targets for FFY 2014-2018:**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets	
	FSM SPP	State-LEA
<b>2014</b> (2014-2015)	<b>9%</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>2015</b> (2015-2016)	<b>7%</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>2016</b> (2016-2017)	<b>5%</b>	<b>25%</b>
<b>2017</b> (2017-2018)	<b>3%</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>2018</b> (2018-2019)	<b>2%</b>	<b>15%</b>

**FSM-SPECIFIC Indicator 2: Percent of students with IEP’s dropping out of elementary school.**

**FSM-SPECIFIC Measurement:** States must report the percentage of students with an IEP in elementary school who drop-out.

**FSM-SPECIFIC Data Source:** FSM utilizes the following data sources:

- # of students with IEPs dropping out of elementary school
- # of students with IEPs attending public elementary school at the beginning of the school year.

**FSM-SPECIFIC Performance Data for FFY 2016 (2016-2017):**

State LEA	# & % Drop-Outs		
	2016-2017		
	(a)	(b)	(c)
	#Students in Elementary Schools	#Drop-Outs from Elementary Schools	% Drop-Outs (b)/(a) x 100
Students <b>without</b> IEPs	969	0	%
Students <b>with</b> IEPs	134	0	%
Total	1,103	0	%

**2016-2017**

	IEP/GenEd	Drop-outs	%
SES	16/185	0/0	0%
TES	37/419	0/0	0%
WES	4/47	0/0	0%
MES	31/210	0/0	0%
LES	29/315	0/0	0%
UES	17/211	0/0	0%

**Tracking of Elem. Drop Outs:  
2016-2017**

	IEP/GenEd	Drop-outs
SES		
TES		
WES		
MES		
LES		
UES		

Table 1 FY 2016-2017 indicate that 1,199 students without IEPs were enrolled in elementary level along with 94 students with IEPs. Therefore a total of are in Elementary School for this reporting period. Compulsory Age policy is still effective and attempts were made to reinstate the students however parents still refuse school admittance.

**FSM SPECIFIC LEA Targets for FFY 2014-2018:**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
	State-LEA
<b>2014</b> (2014-2015)	<b>0.2%</b>
<b>2015</b> (2015-2016)	<b>0.2%</b>
<b>2016</b> (2016-2017)	<b>0.1%</b>
<b>2017</b> (2017-2018)	<b>0.1%</b>
<b>2018</b> (2018-2019)	<b>0%</b>

**INDICATOR 2 Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2016 (2016-2017):**

Activities	Timeline	Resources
<b>1. <u>Improve Data Collection and Reporting:</u></b> Drop out Report	Monthly	Principals & GL Teachers
<b>2. <u>Collaboration/Coordination:</u></b> Awareness Program Compulsory Ed. Age PTA Meeting Radio Spots	2x per yr (January & June)  Quarterly	LSIP TEAM KWA
<b>3. <u>Collaboration/Coordination:</u></b> Establish Parents & Students Support Survey	Jan-June 2015	Counselor
<b>4. <u>Improve Data Collection and Reporting:</u></b> Data Collection at each school sites	A Week Before December 1, 2015	Data Managers



**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**IDEA Indicator 3: Participation and performance of children with IEPs on statewide assessments:**

- A. Percent of districts with a disability subgroup that meets the State’s minimum “n” size that meet the State’s AYP targets for the disability subgroup.**
- B. Participation rate for children with IEPs.**
- C. Proficiency rate for children with IEPs against grade level, modified, and alternate academic achievement standards.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**IDEA Measurement:**

- A. Not applicable to FSM.
- B. Participation rate percent = [(# of children with IEPs participating in an assessment) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs enrolled during the testing window, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The participation rate is based on all children with IEPs, including both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.
- C. Proficiency rate percent = ((# of children with IEPs scoring at or above proficient against grade level, modified and alternate academic achievement standards) divided by the (total # of children with IEPs who received a valid score and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, and, calculated separately for reading and math)]. The proficiency rate includes both children with IEPs enrolled for a full academic year and those not enrolled for a full academic year.

It is a requirement that all students in the state take part in the National Minimum Competency Test (NMCT). Result of the NMCT is stored in the Department’s data system and reported to the National Department of Education to analyze, aggregate and disaggregate data and return to the State for reporting and disseminated to the public. The program provided a listing of IEP students who needed to take the NMCT for that SY to the Testing Coordinator for verification and assigniing of special code for students with IEPs. In the previous year the program provided four of its staff to be part of the Central Office Testing Team, as proctors and to verify the students in the program. The accuracy of data is through cross checking of the raw data in the system and verifying with the listing provided to the testing division.

**IDEA Performance Data for FFY 2016 (2016-2017):**

**Measurement A:** AYP requirement under NCLB does not apply to FSM.

**Measurement B: Participation Rate**

NMCT Lang. Art	2016-2017 National Minimum Competency Test (NMCT) Results for Participation						
	a. # in Grade	b. # NO Accommodations	c. # with Accommodations	d. # Alternate Assess – Grade Level Standards	e. # Alternate Assess – Modified Standards	f. # Alternate Assess – Alternate Standards (AA-AAS)	% b + c + d + e + f divided by a
Grade 6						1	
Grade 8						1	
Grade 10						1	
<b>TOTAL #</b>						<b>3</b>	
<b>%</b>							

NMCT	2016-2017 National Minimum Competency Test (NMCT) Results for Participation						
	a. # in	b. # NO	c. # with	d. # Alternate Assess –	e. # Alternate Assess –	f. # Alternate Assess –	% b + c + d + e +

**FSM STATE: Kosrae**

Math	Grade	Accommodations	Accommodations	Grade Level Standards	Modified Standards	Alternate Standards (AA-AAS)	f divided by a
Grade 4						0	
Grade 6						1	
Grade 8						1	
Grade 10						1	
<b>TOTAL #</b>						<b>3</b>	
<b>%</b>							

**Measurement C: Proficiency Rate**

NMCT Lang. Art	2016-2017 National Minimum Competency Test (NMCT) Results for Proficiency						
	a. # in Grade with valid score	b. # Proficient and above with NO Accommodations	c. # Proficient and above with Accommodations	d. # Proficient and above in Alternate Assess – Grade Level Standards	e. # Proficient and above in Alternate Assess – Modified Standards	f. # Proficient and above in Alternate Assess – Alternate Standards (AA-AAS)	% b + c + d + e + f divided by a
Grade 6							
Grade 8							
Grade 10							
<b>TOTAL #</b>							
<b>%</b>							

NMCT Math	2016-2017 National Minimum Competency Test (NMCT) Results for Proficiency						
	a. # in Grade with valid score	b. # Proficient and above with NO Accommodations	c. # Proficient and above with Accommodations	d. # Proficient and above in Alternate Assess – Grade Level Standards	e. # Proficient and above in Alternate Assess – Modified Standards	f. # Proficient and above in Alternate Assess – Alternate Standards (AA-AAS)	% b + c + d + e + f divided by a
Grade 4							
Grade 6							
Grade 8							
Grade 10							
<b>TOTAL #</b>							
<b>%</b>							

**IDEA FSM SPP AND LEA Targets for FFY 2014-2018:**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets					
	FSM SPP	State-LEA	FSM SPP		State-LEA	
	3B	3B	3C-Math	3C-Rdg	3C-Math	3C-Rdg
<b>2014</b> (2014-2015)	<b>100%</b>		<b>4%</b>	<b>4%</b>		
<b>2015</b> (2015-2016)	<b>100%</b>		<b>6%</b>	<b>6%</b>		
<b>2016</b> (2016-2017)	<b>100%</b>		<b>8%</b>	<b>8%</b>		
<b>2017</b> (2017-2018)	<b>100%</b>		<b>10%</b>	<b>10%</b>		
<b>2018</b> (2018-2019)	<b>100%</b>		<b>10%</b>	<b>10%</b>		

A printout listing of all IEP students on all check point 4<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, 10<sup>th</sup> were given a week before the Assessment week to the Assessment Team in order for them to know number of IEP students that will need to take the NMCT & MCRT during this reporting period. Three of the program staff, case managers were also included as part of the assessment team in order to identify and make sure those IEP students at each community schools were tested along with the regular education students, and also to do any modifications to the test if needed.

**INDICATOR 3: Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2016 (2016-2017):**

Activities	Timeline	Resources
1. <b>Improve Systems</b>	No later than March	Principals/ RR Supervisor

<p><b>Administration &amp; Monitoring:</b> Revisit student's IEP (Accommodations')</p>		
<p>2. <b><u>Provide Technical Assistant/ Training/ Professional Development.</u></b> Training (4-Step Process)</p>	<p>March 1, 2015</p>	<p>TAC (NDOE)</p>
<p>3. <b><u>Improve System Administration and Monitoring:</u></b> Request Separate Testing Dates for miss out students</p>	<p>Week after testing dates</p>	<p>LSIP</p>
<p>4. <b><u>Improve Systems Administration and Monitoring:</u></b> Assign someone for IEP accommodation monitoring at the school sites.</p>	<p>Once every quarter</p>	<p>KIAC rep RR Supervisor PTA rep..</p>

**Monitoring Priority: FAPE in the LRE**

**IDEA Indicator 7: Percent of preschool children with IEPs who demonstrate improved:**

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);**
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy); and**
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416 (a)(3)(A))

**IDEA Measurement:**

Outcomes:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

Progress categories for A, B and C:

- a. Percent of preschoolers who did not improve functioning = [(# of preschoolers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of preschoolers with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of preschoolers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschoolers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschoolers with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of preschoolers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of preschoolers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of preschoolers with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschoolers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschoolers with IEPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of preschoolers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of preschoolers with IEPs assessed)] times 100.

**Summary Statements for Each of the Three Outcomes (use for FFY 2008-2009 reporting):**

**Summary Statement 1:** Of those preschoolers who entered or exited early childhood special education below age expectations in each Outcome, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 1:**

Percent = # of preschoolers reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschoolers reported in category (d) divided by [# of preschoolers reported in progress category (a) plus # of preschoolers reported in progress category (b) plus # of preschoolers reported in progress category (c) plus # of preschoolers reported in progress category (d)] times 100.

**Summary Statement 2:** The percent of preschoolers who were functioning within age expectations in each Outcome by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.

**Measurement for Summary Statement 2:** Percent = # of preschoolers reported in progress category (d) plus [# of preschoolers reported in progress category (e) divided by the total # of preschoolers reported in progress categories (a) + (b) + (c) + (d) + (e)] times 100.

**IDEA Performance Data and Discussion for FFY 2016 (2016-2017):**

Progress Data Categories for Preschool Outcomes, as of June 30, 2017

Categories		Outcome A	Outcome B	Outcome C
		Positive Social-Emotional Skills (including social relationships)	Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills (including early language/ communication and early literacy)	Use Appropriate Behaviors to Meet their Needs
		# & %	# & %	# & %
a.	Percent of preschool children who did not improve functioning	0 / 13 (0%)	0 / 13 (0%)	0 / 13 (0%)
b.	Percent of preschool children who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers	1 / 13 (8%)	0 / 13 (0%)	0 / 13 (0%)
c.	Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to a level nearer to	0/13 (0%)	4/13 (31%)	2/13 (15%)

Categories		Outcome A	Outcome B	Outcome C
		Positive Social-Emotional Skills (including social relationships)	Acquisition and Use of Knowledge and Skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)	Use Appropriate Behaviors to Meet their Needs
		# & %	# & %	# & %
	same-aged peers but did not reach it.			
d.	Percent of preschool children who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers	7/13 (54%)	8/13 (62%)	8/13 (62%)
e.	Percent of preschool children who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers	5 / 13 (38%)	1 / 13 (8%)	3 / 13 (23%)
Total %		13/13 =100%	13/13 =100 %	13/13 = 100%

**Performance Data for Preschool Children Exiting 2013-2014**

Summary Statements	% of children
<b>Outcome A: Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships)</b>	
<b>Summary Statement 1:</b> Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome A, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	Data Taken from Outcome A: (c + d) / (a+b+c+d)  <b>88%</b>
<b>Summary Statement 2:</b> The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome A by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	Data Taken from Outcome A: d + e /TOTAL  <b>92%</b>
<b>Outcome B: Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy)</b>	
<b>Summary Statement 1:</b> Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome B, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	Data Taken from Outcome B: (c + d) / (a+b+c+d)  <b>1%</b>
<b>Summary Statement 2:</b> The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome B by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	Data Taken from Outcome B: d + e /TOTAL  <b>69%</b>
<b>Outcome C: Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs</b>	
<b>Summary Statement 1:</b> Of those children who entered the program below age expectations in Outcome C, the percent who substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	Data Taken from Outcome C: (c + d) / (a+b+c+d)  <b>1%</b>
<b>Summary Statement 2:</b> The percent of children who were functioning within age expectations in Outcome C by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program.	Data Taken from Outcome C: d + e /TOTAL  <b>85%</b>

*During the SY 2016-2017, there were 36 IEP students, and out of this count, there were 13 students exited the ECE Sped Program. 0% of these children did not improve functioning in both of the three outcomes. 0% improved functioning but not sufficient to nearer to functioning comparable to same age peers; 0% improve functioning to reach a level nearer to same age-peers, but did not reach it; 54%*

*improve functioning to reach a level comparable to same age-peers; and 38% maintained functioning. In outcome B, 0% of these children did not improve functioning; 0% improved functioning, but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age-peers; 31% improved to a level nearer to same age-peers; but did not reach it; 62% improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same age-peers, and 8% maintained functioning.*

*In outcome C, 0% did not improve functioning; 0% improved functioning, but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same age-peers; 15% improved functioning to a level nearer to same age-peers, but did not reach it; 62% improved functioning to a level nearer to same age-peers, and 23% maintained functioning.*

**Summary Statement 1:** *Of the 36 IEP students entered the program, 13 of them exited ECE Sped Program and 88% of them entered the program below age expectations and had substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned 6 years of age or exited the program in outcome A.*

**Summary Statement 2:** *Of the 13 students, 92% were functioning within age expectations by the time they six or exited the program in outcome A.*

**Summary Statement 1:** *Of the 13 students, 1% of them substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six or exited the program in outcome B.*

**Summary Statement 2:** *Of the 13 students, 69% were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned six or exited the program in outcome B.*

**Summary Statement 1:** *Of the 13 students who entered the program, 1% of them substantially increased their rate of growth by the time they turned six or exited the program in outcome C.*

**Summary Statement 2:** *Of these 13 students, 85% of them were functioning within age expectations by the time they turned six or exited the program in outcome C*

Kosrae state will use 59% as baseline for summary statement 1 with 2% increase every two year until year 2018, summary statement 2, we've set 18% to start with until 2018 for Outcome A. (verify targets for outcome b & c)

To meet this indicator's measurement requirement, these are the steps taken for the development of each Entry and Exit Data. Within 45 days after each IEP's are developed, the ECE Special Education teachers interviews parents of their children's functional skill observed at home and other settings. With their own observations, the teachers than compiled these information and submit them to the Program Supervisor for analysis and reporting. The Program Supervisor than collect other sources of information (RSAs & CSHN, when applicable), with the results of the FSM-ID analysis, the students' score then inputted into the (Early Childhood Outcome) ECO summary forms which is then converted into OSEP category reporting form.

The Exit data for transitioning/exiting students are collected 1-2 weeks after school is over for each school year. The process of collecting and analyzing the data for Exit is much the same as the Entry.

*At the program administrative level, a three level- case review procedure has been put in place with the endorsement of the State Director of Education whereby al completed IEPs are routed as follows:*

*Developed IEPs are forwarded by the site supervisors for review and verification by the case managers, any discrepancies identified in the IEP development process must be referred back to the site supervisor with recommendations from the case managers for corrections and modifications based on the findings. However, IEPs without discrepancies or findings are forwarded to Data Manager for final review and students were referred and the program then proceeds with the special education process. Collection of data has been improve through the training provided to the ECE staff on data analysis on the FSM-ID and other training provided by the both regular ECE Coordinator, and Sped ECE Supervisor.*

**IDEA FSM SPP AND LEA Targets for FFY 2014-2018:**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets					
	FSM SPP	State-LEA	FSM SPP	State-LEA	FSM-SPP	State-LEA
	7A	7A	7B	7B	7C	7C
<b>2014</b> (2014-2015)	#1= 83% #2 = 71%	#1=59% #2=18%	#1= 78.25% #2 = 62%	#1=71% #2=12%	#1= 85% #2 = 75%	#1=77% #2=24%
<b>2015</b> (2015-2016)	#1= 83% #2 = 71%	#1=59% #2=18%	#1= 78.25% #2 = 63%	#1=71% #2=12%	#1= 85% #2 = 75%	#1=78% #2=24%
<b>2016</b> (2016-2017)	#1= 85% #2 = 71%	#1=61% #2=18%	#1= 78.50% #2 = 64%	#1=71.25% #2=13%	#1= 86% #2 = 75%	#1=78% #2=24%
<b>2017</b> (2017-2018)	#1= 85% #2 = 71%	#1=61% #2=18%	#1= 78.50% #2 = 65%	#1=71.25% #2=14%	#1= 87% #2 = 75%	#1=79% #2=24%
<b>2018</b> (2018-2019)	#1 = 85% #2 = 71%	#1=61% #2=18%	#1= 80.25% #2 = 65.25%	#1=73% #2=14.25%	#1=87.25% #2=69%	#1=79.25% #2=24%

**INDICATOR 7: Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2016 (2016-2017):**

Activities	Timeline	Resources
<b><u>1. Provide Technical Assistant/Training/Professional Development- Professional Development</u></b>	2x per year	ECE Staff
<b><u>2. To improve students performance measure outcome A-2, B-2, and C-2 by 5.5%.</u></b>	Monthly/Quarterly	ECE Staff
<b><u>3. Provide Technical Assistant/Training/Professional Development- ECO Training/ Workshop</u></b>	August/Sept. (Beginning of SY)	ECE Staff/Marbe

**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part B / Effective Transition**

**IDEA Indicator 14: Percent of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school, and were:**

- A. Enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school.**
- B. Enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school.**
- C. Enrolled in higher education or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment within one year of leaving high school.**

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B))

**Measurement:**

- A. Percent enrolled in higher education = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- B. Percent enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education or competitively employed within one year of leaving high school) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.
- C. Percent enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment = [(# of youth who are no longer in secondary school, had IEPs in effect at the time they left school and were enrolled in higher education, or in some other postsecondary education or training program; or competitively employed or in some other employment) divided by the (# of respondent youth who are no longer in secondary school and had IEPs in effect at the time they left school)] times 100.

**IDEA Performance Data and Discussion for FFY 2016 (2016-2017):**

**Table 1: 2012-2013 Percentage of Leavers Who were Respondents in 2013-2014 Survey**

<b>Year of Leavers (One Year Prior to Reporting Year)</b>	<b>(a) # of Leavers (Based on 618 Table 4 submitted for OSEP reporting on Nov 1, 2016)</b>	<b>(b) # of Leavers Who Responded to the One- Year Follow-Up</b>	<b>(c) % Respondents (b) divided by (a) times 100</b>
2016-2017			%

**Table 2: 2013-2014 # Respondents in the following Areas:**

<b>Reporting Year</b>	<b># of Respondents (from Table 1 (b))</b>	<b>Respondents in One of the Following Areas after One Year of Leaving Secondary School, following the PSO Survey</b>				
		<b>(1) # enrolled in higher education</b>	<b>(2) # competitively employed.</b>	<b>(3) # postsecondary education or training</b>	<b>(4) # other employed</b>	<b>(5) # other or Not Engaged</b>
2016-2017						

**Table 3: Percentage of Respondents in the Three Indicator Measures:**

<b>Reporting Year</b>	<b># of Respondents (from Table 1 (b))</b>	<b>Percentage of Respondents in the Three Indicator Measurement Areas:</b>		
		<b>(A)</b>	<b>(B)</b>	<b>(C)</b>
		Table 2 (1) divided by total # respondents from Table 1 (b) times 100	Table 2 (1)+(2) divided by total # respondents from Table 1 (b) times 100	Table 2 (1)+(2)+(3)+(4) divided by total # respondents from Table 1 (b) times 100
2016-2017		%	%	%



At the end of each school year the transition teachers at the Kosrae High School conducted a survey to all leavers up to one year after leaving high school. Upon leaving high school, there was no formal contact made by the school personnel with the students until the time when the survey is conducted. Nineteen (19) surveys were disseminated and the 19 respondents were received during the SY 2013-2014. Out of the nineteen (19) respondents six (6) are attending higher institute, ten (10) competitively employed, and three (3) are not engaged. The state has met the target of 84% and will increase by 1% for the first three years and for the remaining two years for 2% increase to align with the FSM- SPP target.

--

**IDEA FSM SPP AND LEA Targets for FFY 2014-2018:**

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Targets					
	FSM SPP	State-LEA	FSM SPP	State-LEA	FSM-SPP	State-LEA
	14A	14A	14B	14B	14C	14C
2014 (2014-2015)	9%	27%	40%	84%	60%	84%
2015 (2015-2016)	11%	29%	45%	85%	62%	85%
2016 (2016-2017)	13%	31%	50%	86%	64%	86%
2017 (2017-2018)	14%	33%	55%	88%	68%	88%
2018 (2018-2019)	14%	33%	60%	90%	70%	90%

**INDICATOR 14: Improvement Activities/Timelines/Resources for FFY 2014 (2014-2015):**

ACTIVITY	TIMELINE	RESOURCES
<p><b>1. <u>Improve Systems Administration and Monitoring:</u></b> Monitoring and tracking of leavers for up to one year after graduation</p>	Nov. 2015	<p>Secondary Transition Advisory Council Case Managers</p>
<p><b>2. <u>Improve Data Collection and Reporting:</u></b> Develop Schedule for conducting the survey, person responsible and when to finalize collection and analysis of data collected.</p>	Dec. 2015	<p>Case Manager, KHS RR Transition Teachers</p>